

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for reviewing and considering the pending application. The *Office Action* dated February 25, 2008 has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1, 8-12, 14-18, and 25 are hereby amended. Claim 7 is canceled and claims 13, 27 and 31-35 were previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-26, and 28-30 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate and thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 9 and 25 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants also appreciate and thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the June 3, 2008 personal interview. The substance of the interview is set forth below and constitutes a record of the interview.

Claims 1 and 7 are objected to based on formal matters. Claim 1 is amended to obviate the objection. Claim 7 is canceled, and thus the objection is now moot.

Claims 9 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9 and 25 are amended as discussed in the during the interview. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,281,699 to Grube ("*Grube*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the interview, claim 1 recites, among other features, a plurality of supplementary members extended from a circumference of the hub to a space between the ribs and coupled to a lower part and an upper part of the ribs alternately. Referring to Figs. 1-5 of *Grube*, nowhere does *Grube* disclose or suggest the above-noted feature of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 recites allowable subject matter.

Claims 2-6, 7, 10-12, and 14-21 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 22-24, 26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Grube* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,868,079 to Johnson (“*Johnson*”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 recites, among other features, an inclination direction of a first extension member adjacent to the first side is different than an inclination direction of a second extension member adjacent to the second side.

Grube does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 22. The Office Action at page attempts to use Fig 5 of *Grube* to read on the above-noted features of claim 22. However, the Office Action’s interpretation is incorrect. *Grube*’s Fig. 5 is a side view of a threaded joint with a locking fastener in a tightened condition. *Grube*’s Fig. 4 is a side view of the threaded joint with a locking fastener in the snug tight condition prior to tightening. That is, as shown in Figs. 4 and 5, the fastener 10 provides resilient flange regions 30 having a locking teeth 22 in engagement with a work piece 46. Upon tightening of the joint 40, engagement of teeth 22 against the workpiece 46 causes the resilient flange regions 30 axially to deflect or bow away from the workpiece 46. See col. 4, lines 62 to col. 5, line 2.

Therefore, the resilient flange regions 30 is originally horizontal as shown in Fig. 4, and it is deflected or bowed away just when the locking fastener is tightened on the joint 40. Thus, the deflected resilient flange regions 30 has no inclination direction. According, *Grube* does not disclose or suggest an inclination direction of a first extension member adjacent to the first side is different than an inclination direction of a second extension member adjacent to the second side, as recited in claim 22.

Johnson does not cure this deficiency. *Johnson* is used to disclose a threaded locking nut attached to a leg bolt of a home appliance.

Claims 23-24, 26, and 28-30 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 22.


The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in

condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  Yong (u.)
by W. 43.32 P
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant